

Vinyl 2010 Essay Competition

ID number: 686

Summary:

As most of the people seek to ensure their well-being by having money, health and love, most of the countries seek to achieve different objectives, which are highlighted and measured using several quantitative and qualitative standards or requirements. People fight to build wind turbines, discover new technologies for green house gas emission reduction, exploit thermal water and waves for energy or bring oil and gas from across the oceans, but they hit a concrete wall when having to build partnerships because of the rigidity and autocracy of the systems and because of the political involvement.

Essay:

Usually the countries are blinded by choosing objectives which reflect values such as power, strength and competitiveness, mostly measured in a subjective way, considering the economic richness. The point where the crisis starts is either caused by setting objectives impossible to reach or by defining objectives by their own will. What I consider the states should take into account is that being different is not always a wrong way. Especially nowadays, we all seek to standardize our work, our goal; we seek to align ourselves with the stronger and developed countries, in order to ensure our future. This is not a wrong conception, only we should also take into consideration that our traditions and values come from our differences and that our exceeded obligations and loans come from desires that may sometimes be hard to achieve.

For example, we are all aware of the benefits brought by the technical and technological progress and of communication, because of the spread of globalization. But do we all take into consideration the fact that as more and more countries seek help and protection and means for further development by adhering to multinational organization, the countries which do not do that are more and more left behind, at a status of under-development?

Many of the states are aimed by the desire of becoming members of the main multinational bodies, such as the United Nations or the European Union. Of course, this is desirable and it brings a lot of benefits, only for some of the possible future members the targets set by these organisms may not be realistic or very hard to reach. Therefore, the solution is to objectively take into consideration the requirements and the position of the country, balance the benefits and the changes needed and only afterwards decide what should be done before applying for the membership.

Such as people only think at the benefits and hope they will find a saving solution, countries seem to forget to measure the implications of such processes in advance and only realize them when being faced with difficulties.

Also, thinking of yourself and your well-being is desirable, only most of the developed or powerful countries seem to forget that the strength itself causes damage to other states. For example, the greatest nations of the world have always succeeded, even if the natural resources or work force were not their strongest points at all times. They succeeded because they knew how to exploit opportunities when they appeared and

because they had the money to do so. In consequence, big incomes, a high rate of the GDP, a low rate of inflation or unemployment are our guidelines for what we define as a developed country. Fair enough, only does anyone think of the consequences that progress in economics, science and technology has upon the less developed countries? Of course, we try to use the latest technologies and always raise our competitiveness, but does this influence the poorer? It definitely does. A country that can hardly ensure money for its population to eat or work will only have to become more and more in-debt in order to keep-up with the progress and development rate set by the others. This until a point, when it will become impossible to survive in these conditions anymore and it will only be left behind.

Naturally, it should be set by the unwritten laws, to help the poorer ones. But no country or international organisation will be there to do so if one can't cope with the requirements and must constantly be helped.

And then we ask ourselves, which is the solution? The solution is in the middle, hidden in the attitude of people and their willingness to discuss and help the others. It is not the natural resources, their abundance or their lack; it is not the money or the power that a nation has that makes the difference, but it is the will to find a solution, a compromise, of which the two parties can benefit.

And I believe the crisis may lead us to this solution, either to a great future ahead or to a terrible mess. Along the history, the powerful nations have always looked for new territories, new resources, new slaves or money. This led them to wars and misunderstandings. Then they headed for their own well-being and this went on well, but it created differences. Now we see differences as something bad. The poorer look at the richer as something impossible to achieve and the richer look at poorer as something left behind or not good enough to be taken into consideration.

We could survive now as nations exchanged goods in the past. There are countries which possess resources, other which possess technology, others which possess work force and so on. If we take into consideration the predictions of hard times to come due to the climate changes, sustainable development needs, financial crisis, resources limitation, we must also turn to the benefits of today's world, especially those brought by the expanded communication around the world. If we can hear what is happening on the other side of the globe, why can't we think of collaboration between people for our mutual well-being?

Instead of fighting and fearing the future because of political goals, economic barriers or authority and legislation we should focus on creating a mutual bridge for our common future. A bridge built on negotiations, partnerships and understanding.